## PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

INIE	RNATIONAL SEAL	ACHING AUTH	ORITY					
To:					PCT			
					,			
	•							
	ooo form l	DCT4CA DD0		WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY  (PCT Rule 43bis.1)  Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)				
	see iorm i	PCT/ISA/220						
		•						
A	icant's or agent's file	rotorono						
	form PCT/ISA/22			FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below				
				<u> </u>				
	national application N T/NL2004/000200		International filing date (d 24.03.2004	lay/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 24.03.2003			
					24.03.2003			
			both national classification	and IPC				
A21	C3/02, A21C3/06	<b>5</b>			•			
• •	icant							
KA	AK, Johan Hendri	ik Bernard						
4	This opinion on	ntaina indiaatie	one relating to the follo	wina itama:				
1.	This opinion co	mains molean	ons relating to the follo	wing items.				
	☑ Box No. I Basis of the opinion							
	☑ Box No. II							
	Box No. III	Non-establishm	nent of opinion with rega	ard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability				
☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention								
	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 432 applicability; citations and explanation			is.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial as supporting such statement				
	Box No. VI	Certain docume	ents cited	plication				
	☐ Box No. VII	Certain defects	in the international appl					
	☐ Box No. VIII	Certain observa	ations on the internation	al application				
2.	FURTHER ACTIO	ON	•	•				
<b>-</b> `.								
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.								
If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date whichever expires later.								
	For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.							
3.	3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.							



Name and mailing address of the ISA:

**Authorized Officer** 





# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/NL2004/000200

_							
_	Во	x No. I	Basis of the opinion				
1.	. Wit	With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.					
	⊠	langua	pinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following ge English, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).				
2.	With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:						
	a. ty	pe of n	naterial:				
	Ε	⊐ ase	equence listing				
	[	∃ tabl	e(s) related to the sequence listing				
	b. fo	ormat of	material:				
	C	J in w	ritten format				
		∃ in c	omputer readable form				
	c. tii	me of fil	ing/turnishing:				
	[	on.	ained in the international application as filed.				
	C	J filed	together with the international application in computer readable form.				
	Ε	] furn	ished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.				
3.		has bed copies	ion, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating theretoen filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as riate, were furnished.				
4.	Addi	itional c	omments:				

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

_	Box	No. II	Priority					
The following document has not been furnished:     □ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43)						<b>j</b> :		
						iority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).		
		☑ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).						
		Conse	der the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has ion that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.					
2.	This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.							
3.	3. Additional observations, if necessary:							
	Bo:	x No. V ustrial	bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or ns supporting such statement					
1. Sta		tement						
	Novelty (N) Inventive step (IS)		Yes: No:	Claims Claims	3,4,5,6,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,17,18,19,20 1,2,7,8,16,21,22,23			
			Yes: No:	Claims Claims	3,4,5,6,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,17,18,19,20			
Ind		dustrial applicability (IA)		Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-23		

#### Re Item V.

The following document is referred to in this communication:
D1: DE 24 51 329 A (HAAGSE BAKKERIJMACH) 22 May 1975 (1975-05-22)

#### 2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

2.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT. Document D1 discloses (the references in parenthesis applying to this document): A device for forming a dough portion comprising a pressure roller (8) and a counter roller (8) placed below it for in between them rolling out the dough portion into a dough slice, wherein the device comprises a conveyor belt (1) for conveying and at least in the direction of conveyance supporting the dough slice to a further treatment device (2) during and after rolling out, wherein the conveyor belt (1) is passed through between the pressure roller (8) and the counter roller (8) and abuts the counter roller (8).

### 3 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 21

The same reasoning applies, mutatis mutandis, to the subject-matter of the corresponding independent claim 21 which therefore is also considered not new.

4 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-20, 22,23

Dependent claims 2-20, 22, 23 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT).